

Meeting Summary – Public Meeting on Practical Alternatives

The second public meeting for the US-12 Improvement Study was held on November 19, 2002 from 3:00-5:30 pm and 7:00-8:30 pm at the Pittsfield Township Administrative Offices. The meeting was conducted in an open-house format with MDOT personnel and study consultants positioned at various information stations. No formal presentations were given. The seven information stations included 1) *Study Process*, 2) *Practical Alternatives*, 3) *Cross-Section Examples*, 4) *Impact Analysis*, 5) *US-23 Interchange Concepts*, 6) *Access Management*, and 7) *Illustrative Alternatives and Traffic*. A *Sign-In* station at the entrance of the hall allowed meeting attendees to provide their address for inclusion into the study's mailing list. A *Public Comment* station, located in the center of the hall, was available for participants to submit written comments to MDOT and study consultants.

Between the two sessions, 70 people attended as determined by the sign in sheet. A total of 36 written comments and one prepared statement were received.

The written comments were reviewed and categorized under five main headings, **Practical Alternative 1-N**, **Practical Alternative 1**, **Cross-Sections**, **US-23 Interchanges**, **Additional Concerns**, and **General Comments**.

Practical Alternative 1

Five (5) written comments expressed support for Practical Alternative 1.

Two (2) of these five individuals favor the five-lane urban arterial and three (3) favor the four-lane urban boulevard.

Those who support Practical Alternative 1 cited the following reasons:

- Major benefits gained by widening the existing route
- Least obtrusive alternative

Those who oppose Practical Alternative 1 cited the following reasons:

- Residential displacement
- Increase in noise and pollution
- Disrupt integrity and character of established neighborhood

Additional comments

- Leave US-12 where it is and lessen the curves where possible
- Why would we pave over additional land when the projected increase in volume could be accommodated on the current path?

Practical Alternative 1-N

Fifteen (15) written comments expressed support for Practical Alternative 1-N.

Two (2) of these 15 individuals favor the five-lane urban arterial and three (3) favor the four-lane urban boulevard.

Those who support Practical Alternative 1-N cited the following reasons:

- Improved safety for children and pets
- Reduction in noise
- Improved access and traffic flow for motorists and emergency vehicles
- Decreased severity of curves on US-12
- Property values won't be impacted
- Will move traffic away from congested residential area.

Those who oppose Practical Alternative 1-N cited the following reasons:

- Impacts to parkland and wetlands
- Not any safer since same number of curves would be created
- Concerned that the property along Textile would become commercial and would impact property values
- Concern about increased noise along Textile Road

Additional comments

- Leaving on current alignment only puts off the problem.
- Preservation of historical properties is 50% less with Practical Alternative 1-N
- The environment can still be preserved because Practical Alternative 1-N wouldn't impact all of the woodlands and wetlands.
- Area between US-12 and Textile would make a good community/transition area

Cross-Sections

Four-Lane Urban Boulevard

Those who support four-lane urban boulevard cited the following reasons:

- Safer roadway
- Like the aesthetics of the grass median
- Medians will help slow traffic

Five-Lane Urban Arterial

Those who support five-lane urban arterial cited the following reasons:

- Less impact on the land

Additional Comments

- The five-lane urban arterial is my least favorite because it seems too "big city" and is similar to a highway
- Support the combination of 4 and 5 lane throughout study corridor.

US-23 Interchanges

Four (4) individuals expressed support for the partial cloverleaf interchange.

Additional comments

- Improve interchange as soon as possible
- Reduce traffic signals on overpass
- Traffic is backed-up half way to Saline because of traffic congestion at interchange

Additional Concerns

Several other concerns were expressed that were not specifically related to the Practical Alternatives. The comments were categorized under safety, noise, air quality, compensation, natural environment, and property values.

Safety

- Left hand turns at Platt intersection are dangerous
- Reduce speed limit
- Angle of the intersection at Platt and US-12 is dangerous
- Too much heavy truck and auto traffic
- Left turns onto US-12 are not safe
- Worry about my children driving on US-12
- Sound barrier in Hickory Pointe subdivision would provide safe environment for children because US-12 traffic is too close

Noise

- Noise levels south of existing US-12 are unacceptable, any increase would be intolerable
- Need to consider sound abatement, either berm or wall
- The current noise level must be at the federal maximum
- Sound barrier would provide safe environment for children
- Please consider different road surfaces, speed limits, berms, or walls to reduce noise.

Air Quality

- Exhaust levels south of existing US-12 are unacceptable
- Pollution (air) is already maxed-out

Compensation

- How will I be compensated for land acquisition?

Natural Environment

- Protect wetland areas along US-12 and minimize impacts to maintain their beauty, quality, and function

Property Values

- The value of my home will decrease by thousands when US-12 is widened
- The value of my home will decrease if Alternative 1 with a five-lane urban arterial is chosen.

General Comments

Fewer lanes the better, two lanes is best, fewer lanes mean less traffic. More lanes mean more traffic.

Leave US-12 just as it is.

Thank you for including the residents and allowing our input. I have nothing but good to say. MDOT officials were a wealth of information and the maps were fabulous.

Thanks for letting me voice my opinion, it is a privilege. Great job thus far.

Thank you for making these meetings available to us and listening to our concerns.

I have been very impressed with MDOT and how knowledgeable and helpful their representatives have been.

Wish you could work a little faster on this issue. I have lived here 9 years and you haven't gotten very far.

Stop the building and decide what you're going to do first.

Stop dragging your feet and make a decision.

I would rather see my tax dollars spent on schools and road/pot hole improvements.

I am not convinced that US-12 is over-burdened with traffic. All streets experience this type of traffic. I don't believe additional lanes to US-12 will relieve congestion.

One-way traffic pair is a bad idea. The one-way pair would be more disadvantageous than beneficial.

Traffic down Warner Road has increased a great deal destroying the dirt road so please pave Warner road to Tamarack, perhaps all the way to Bemis.

I would like to know the figures used to estimate the right of way costs for the 1-N alternative.

How much of the land in this alternative is owned by Pittsfield Township and what is their stance on the issue?

The \$17 million for right of way acquisition is small compared to the impact that Practical Alternative 1 would have on 3,000 residents on the south side of US-12.

How is the new water main along Textile Road going to affect the 1-N alternative?

In regards to phasing, please improve US-23 interchange first.